

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PHONE CALL <input type="checkbox"/> DISCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> FIELD TRIP <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (SPECIFY) _____
(Record of item checked above)		
TO:	FROM:	DATE
Barbra Myatt (GCA) 617-776-5400 (ext. 409)	A. Taverne	4/17/85
SUBJECT		TIME 10:00 AM
<u>Olin-N. Little Rock Endangerment Assessment by GCA</u>		
SUMMARY OF COMMUNICATION		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - she stated that this "draft final" was a courtesy copy ad their contracts office would submit draft around May 1, 85 to HQ ad us w/ better repro's etc. - told her there were problems w/ report does it really provide an "endangerment assessment" would like to see better relation of the field situation (i.e. location of pits, trenches, waste pads etc.) to existing data - she stated that she "thought" she had the aerial photos, geologists who surveyed site had trouble locating anything because no one there knew anything - told her photos should be good for identifying old waste dumps ad their location is needed to be much better defined w.r.t. sampling locations - she said we can suggest revisions on added work they are already \$2,1900 over budget ad the 		
CONCLUSIONS, ACTION TAKEN OR REQUIRED		
<p>past performance period had ended about 10/31/84 they need an extension of work, to start after 6/9/85 under TES II</p> <p style="text-align: right;">GCA primary contr. for TES I PKC " " " TES II ad } (Renew) GCA secondary } (over) over</p>		
INFORMATION COPIES		
TO:	9292499	



talked to Larry Resnick -

he called Brad Wright

Olin NLR not an NPL since state was trying to do it themselves (probably)

should call Chuck Morgan (HQA)

and ask what I can do to get a better idea of the comments and requests necessary to provide a good assessment
purpose is to evaluate whether problem is present from data not re-analyze data

who ~~can~~ should look @ GCA report @ HQ and can they provide comments
what are options for dealing w/ a poor piece of work

May need to talk to Mary Beck w.r.t. TES-II contract & trying to get a specific sub (Steven Lavenhar - Life Systems Inc.) to look @ Enday. asses. prepared by GCA

5/17 (12), AR

AR-264

Status as of 10/1/85

Endangerment Assessment is Draft -

GCA wants \$12k to finalize (Any letter from B. Nigett)

Dean Edwards (N. Little Rock Health Dept.) is doing a well inventory of the area - looking primarily for irrigation wells to try to get a higher MTRC score (see attached notes)

~~Score~~ score should go up ~~base~~ based on:

- greater waste quantity (Quant. = 5) 100-300 tons
- "GW use" = 2
- increased population (targets)

If his results raise score enough to rank the site, then we need to finalize the E.A. @ \$12k (\$16k already spent; but only half has gone directly to EA (\$8000)) - so an addition of \$12k would give a total cost for EA of \$20,000; this is in line w/ current spending on EA's (UNC; Bayon Sonell? or one of Rexnolds sites)

- get results of well inventory ~ 10/15/85
- try to rank site based on new info
- decision to proceed or drop EA 11/1/85

Alan

- a) Resample Road park well
 - b) Sample ~~water~~ groundwater on site
at locations 205, 605 and
 - c) Marsh water and sediment
- ③ Take controlled air sample

Olm - North Little Rock

- This site has documented migration and contamination via Surface and ground water ~~polluted~~ by metals Pb, Zn, Cd and pesticides DDT, chlordane. The main problem is that there are no targets for either route in the area. Groundwater is only used for industrial purposes and surface waters not used for drinking purposes. However, the DC score was

to the ERT above water supply wells for many years ago high concentrations of metals in the DC score